

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-15 are pending. Claims 5, 6, and 11-15 are withdrawn. By this amendment, Claims 1 and 7 are amended, and no claims are added or canceled herewith. Support for the present amendments can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 8, lines 26-35, and in Fig. 5A. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ueda (U.S. Pat. No. 6,719,876) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ueda; Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ueda in view of Takagi (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0020432); Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ueda in view of Gillery (U.S. Patent No. 3,907,660); and Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ueda in view of Nomura (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,614).

First, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Miller for the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicants' representative on November 23, 2009, at which time the outstanding issues in this case were discussed. Arguments similar to the ones developed hereinafter were presented and Examiner Miller indicated that in light of the arguments, he would reconsider the outstanding grounds for rejection upon formal submission of a response. The present response constitutes Applicants' statement of substance of the personal interview.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ueda, Takagi, Gillery, and Nomura, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections and traverse these rejections, as discussed below.

As discussed during the interview, independent Claims 1 and 7 are amended to recite, in part, “the thin films have at least a microcrystalline structure.” During the interview, Examiner Miller acknowledged that Ueda does not disclose or suggest films having a crystalline structure, and that an amendment to Claims 1 and 7 reciting “at least a crystalline structure” would overcome the outstanding rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1 and 7, and all claims dependent thereon, as anticipated by or unpatentable over Ueda, be withdrawn.


Regarding the rejections of Claims 3, 4, 9, and 10, it is noted that Claims 3, 4, 9, and 10 depend on Claims 1 and 7 and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 7. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Takagi, Gillery, and Nomura do not cure the above-noted deficiencies with respect to Ueda. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 3, 4, 9, and 10 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
GJM/AHB

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648

2113833_1.DOC